

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: R.F. Day et al. Attorney Docket No.: MSFT122011
Application No.: 10/783,558 Art Unit: 2134 / Confirmation No: 7539
Filed: February 20, 2004 Examiner: R. Tolentino
Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PROTECTING USER CHOICES

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION

Seattle, Washington 98101

August 14, 2008

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This Response is filed with respect to the remarks made by Examiner in the Advisory Action mailed July 28, 2008.

The remarks in the Advisory Action assert that "Siegel et al. teaches an interface that works with a Web page with a capability that allows verified and authenticated users, which is synonymous with being authorized and modifying a user's profile." Based on this proposition, the Advisory Action asserts that Siegel et al. in view of Challenger describes "receiving an input from a user authorizing an application to modify the user setting" recitation of Claim 1. Applicants disagree.

While Siegel et al. purportedly describes a system whereby a verified and authenticated users could access the user profile and security settings in order to modify them, applicants submit that the difference between Siegel and Claim 1 of the present application lies in that Siegel fails to teach, disclose, or suggest **an application that modifies the settings on the user's behalf** based upon the user's permission. In Siegel et al., it is a user who actually modifies the settings, not an application. Therefore, applicants continue to assert that Siegel in view of Challenger fails to teach the above recitation of Claim 1.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{llc}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

The Advisory Action further asserts that "Challenger teaches configuration settings that can be modified by a user; however, only authorized users are allowed to make changes. Therefore, showing that if a change needs to be made, the watchdog program will prompt a user for a password prior to changes being made." Based on this proposition, the Advisory Action asserts that Challenger teaches the "in response to receiving a request from the application to modify the user choice setting, requesting authorization from the user to modify the user choice setting" recitation of Claim 1. Applicants disagree.

While Challenger purportedly describes configuration settings that can be modified by a user, the difference between Challenger and Claim 1 of the present application is that Claim 1 recites **the system requests authorization from the user for the system** to modify settings in response to an application request to modify the settings. Challenger simply describes a different process. Therefore, applicants continue to assert that Challenger fails to teach the above recitation of Claim 1.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Vladimir Raskin, Ph.D.
Registration No. 62,771
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1799

VXR:mgp

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100